

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

Claims 1, 10, 12 and 19 have been amended; no new matter has been added. Claims 9, 11, 18 and 20 have been cancelled. Thus claims 1-8, 10, 12-17 and 19 remain pending in the present application. In view of the above amendments and following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable.

II. THE 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,211,856 to Choi et al. (hereinafter “Choi”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,509,892 to Cooper et al. (hereinafter “Cooper”). (See 08/09/07 Office Action p. 2)

Claims 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Choi in view of Cooper and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,429,846 to Rosenberg et al. (hereinafter “Rosenberg”). (See 08/09/07 Office Action p. 3).

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of now cancelled claims 9 and 11. Specifically claim 1 has been amended to recite “the GUI displaying a plurality of user-selectable functionalities distributed over multiple display interfaces in a control hierarchy of a system” and “the tactile detectability is provided to the GUI when the user is transitioning between the multiple display interfaces of the control hierarchy.”

In addressing the subject matter that was originally recited in claim 9, the Examiner asserts that Fig. 2a of Choi teaches the multiple display interfaces in a control hierarchy. (See 08/09/07 Office Action p. 3). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Fig. 2a of Choi merely teaches that a single display may contain have control for a VCR a DVD and a TV. These are not “distributed over multiple display interfaces,” but are merely on a single display interface.

In addressing the subject matter that was originally recited in claim 11, the Examiner asserts that Rosenberg, at column 8, lines 1-9, teaches the above-described limitation of newly amended claim 1. (See 08/09/07 Office Action p. 5). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Rosenberg, in column 8, lines 1-9, recites,

Any haptic sensations output on the pad can be transmitted through the held object to the user's hand. For example, the user can hold a stylus having a point that contacts the touchpad 16 more precisely than a finger. Other objects may also be used. In some embodiments, specialized objects can be used to enhance the haptic sensations. For example, a stylus or other object having a flexible portion or compliance may be able to magnify at least some of the touchpad haptic sensations as experienced by the user.

This passage from Rosenberg teaches that a haptic sensation can be transmitted from the device to the user's hand via a specialized object. The above passage (nor any other portion of Rosenberg), however, does not make any reference to when such haptic sensations should be provided to a user. Specifically, neither Choi, Cooper nor Rosenberg, either alone or in combination, teach nor suggest that a "tactile detectability is provided to the GUI when the user is transitioning between the multiple display interfaces of the control hierarchy" as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn. Because claims 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 10 depend from an include all the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Choi in view of Cooper and Rosenberg, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,619,180 to Massimino et al. (hereinafter "Massimino"). (See 08/09/07 Office Action p. 5)

Applicant respectfully submits that Massimino does not cure the above-described deficiencies of Choi, Cooper, and Rosenberg with respect to claim 1. Because claim 3 depends from, and therefore includes all the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is also allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Choi in view of Cooper in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0227374 to Ling et al. (hereinafter “Ling”). (See 08/09/07 Office Action p. 6)

Applicant respectfully submits that Ling does not cure the above-described deficiencies of Choi and Cooper with respect to claim 1. Because claim 8 depends from, and therefore includes all the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is also allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Choi in view of Massimino in further view of Ling. (See 08/09/07 Office Action p. 7)

Independent claim 12 has been amended to recite, “the GUI displaying a plurality of user-selectable functionalities distributed over multiple display interfaces in a control hierarchy of a system” and “the at least one of the vibrotactile means, electrotactile means, and combinations thereof is provided to the GUI when the user is transitioning between the multiple display interfaces of the control hierarchy.” Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 is allowable for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Choi in view of Massimino in further view of Ling. (See 08/09/07 Office Action p. 8)

Because claim 13 and 14 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 12, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 12.

Claims 15-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Choi in view of Massimino and Ling, in further view of Rosenberg. (See 08/09/07 Office Action p. 9)

Applicants submit that Rosenberg does not cure the above-described deficiencies of Choi, Massimino, and Ling with rest to claim 12. Because claim 15-17 and 19 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 12, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 12.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed. An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Please direct all future correspondence to:

Paul Im, Esq.,
IP Counsel

Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9602
Fax: (914) 332-0615
Email: paul.im@philips.com

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Michael Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

Dated: November 9, 2007

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, NY 10038
Phone: 212-619-6000
Fax: 212-619-0276